EPA Official Record

Notes ID: 1ABA7EC32B328BFA852577DD006717D8

From: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US

To: "Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

Delivered Date: 04/14/2009 04:36 PM EDT

Subject: RE: Next Question: CAD Cell Capacities

Anita - we should be careful to be consistent among the various alternatives wrt overall volume, so that means we should NOT be adding a 10% factor here. The volumes already include an overdredge amount, so we'll stick with that for now. Ultimately we'll be adding a contingency percentage so that should cover any volume not captured here.

The 475,289 cy was what I calculated the total dredging thru 2010 to be, but looks like thats not what you were getting at with that number?

Also, and my apologies since I don't have all the reports in front of me, but the "LH" volume you used in the previous table was 161,037 cy, but now you're listing 167,031 cy for MUs33-37...what am I missing here?

Thanks - Dave

"Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com>

"Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com> 04/14/2009 03:59 PM	To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA cc: Subject: RE: Next Question: CAD Cell Capacities

Hi Dave,

I will proceed as indicated. In the mean time, to answer your questions:

1. I applied the 10% to the MU1-24 and MU102-105 volumes only. I interpreted this from a note I made during our conversation on 2/11/09. If you think I should apply the 10% to the volume dredged hydraulically only, I can revise the volume accordingly. It would work out to be more like 579,505 cy.

2. The left-most column is what I use for tracking the cumulative volume in the cost estimate spreadsheets. The MU1-24 & MU102-105 volume (591,085 cy) minus the dredged to date volume (115,289 cy) gives 475,796 cy. Each removal volume increments this number by that volume. Can you tell me what the "475,289 cy" number comes from?

Anita

-----Original Message-----
From: dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:dickerson.dave@epamail.epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2009 2:55 PM
To: Rigassio-Smith, Anita
Cc: Fox, Steve (New Bedford)
Subject: Re: Next Question: CAD Cell Capacities

Hi Anita,

I'm still playing phone tag with Man Chak about our discussion yesterday, so don't take this as final, but I think you're on the right track. But instead of taking the UHCC organics to offshore disposal, why not assume we'd dispose all of these into the LHCC (since our new volume to the LHCC is much lower...i.e we'd still be less than 300,000 cy total to the LHCC). So to answer your question, keep the LHCC around 300,000 (or whatever the new math works out to) but do lower the UHCC volume per the new volume balance.

It looks like you're applying the 10% extra to ALL DMU volumes?

I couldn't get the math to come out exactly as you show in the lower left. I think the problem is that "475,289 cy" should be "475,289 cy"

Thanks - Dave

"Rigassio-Smith, Anita" <Anita.Rigassio-Smith@jacobs.com> 04/14/2009 02:18 PM

To: Dave Dickerson/R1/USEPA/US@EPA
cc: "Fox, Steve \(New Bedford\)" <Steve.Fox@jacobs.com>
Subject: Next Question: CAD Cell Capacities

Hi Dave,

After our conversations yesterday, I worked through the volume calculations with the sequence of 2 more years of hydraulic dredging, build (City) LHCC, then build UHCC. It makes economical sense to dispose of the UH MU material into the UHCC and to dispose of the LH MU material (south of Coggeshall St. Bridge) into the LHCC. So, I assumed the following:
2 years (2009 and 2010) of hydraulic dredging with T&D disposal contaminated organics from construction of UHCC to LHCC [18,300 cy]
material from MU33-37 to LHCC [167,031 cy]
remaining (not dredged through 2010) material from MU1-24, -102, -105 to UHCC [115,796 cy]
material from MU25-32 to UHCC [114,684 cy]

The attached spreadsheet shows the volume balance for the two CAD cells with the above assumptions. The effect of an extra year of hydraulic dredging results in too much capacity in the CAD cells.

For the purpose of the $80M/year scenario, should I reduce the volume of the UHCC to something like 230K cy or 240K cy; and that for the LHCC to something like 190K cy?

Anita

NOTICE - This communication may contain confidential and privileged information that is for the sole use of the intended recipient. Any viewing, copying or distribution of, or reliance on this message by unintended recipients is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by replying to the message and deleting it from your computer.